arXiv:1510.04015v1 [cs.GT] 14 Oct 2015

On equilibria of N-seller and N-buyer Bargaining Games

Jiawei Li

Independent researcher, Nottingham, UK

E-mail: jiawei.michael.li@gmail.com

A group of players that contains *n* sellers and *n* buyers bargain over the partitions of *n* pies. A seller (/buyer) has to reach an agreement with a buyer (/seller) on the division of a pie. The players bargain in a system like the stock market: each seller(buyer) can either offer a selling(buying) price to all buyers(sellers) or accept a price offered by another buyer(seller). The offered prices are known to all. Once a player accepts a price offered by another one, the division of a pie between them is determined. Each player has a constant discounting factor and the discounting factors of all players are common knowledge. In this article, we prove that the equilibrium of this bargaining problem is a unanimous division rate that is exactly equivalent to Nash bargaining equilibrium of a two-player bargaining game in which the discounting factors of two players are the average of *n* buyers and the average of *n* sellers respectively. This result is nontrivial for studying general equilibrium of markets.

Introduction

Game theorists have developed the axiomatic approach and sequential approach for two-player bargaining games. With a series of axiomatic assumptions, Nash has proved the unique equilibrium of two-player bargaining games (Nash 1950). Rubinstein (1982) has developed the sequential strategic approach in which two players take turns making alternating offers. In the case where each player has a constant discounting factor (δ_1 and δ_2), the solution is proved to be $(1-\delta_2)/(1-\delta_1\delta_2)$. Binmore, Rubinstein and Wolinskyet (1986) discussed the relationship between these two approaches.

For the bargaining problems with more than two players, the uniqueness of the perfect equilibrium outcome does not hold even under the condition of common discounting factor (Sutton 1986; Herrero 1985; Haller 1986). This bargaining game is described as multiple players trying to reach an agreement on how to share a pie between them. Chae and Yang (1988), Yang (1992), Krishna and Serrano (1996) have proven that the uniqueness of perfect equilibrium can be achieved by introducing the exit opportunity. Recent related work on $n \geq 3$-person bargaining game also includes Asheim (1992), Winter (1994), Merlo and Wilson (1995), Dasgupta and Chiu (1998), Vannetelbosch (1999), Calvo-Armengo (1999), Chatterjee and Sabourian (2000), Vidal-Puga (2004), De Fontenay and Gans (2004), Kultti and Vartiainen (2008), Santamaria (2009), Torstensson (2009), and Yan (2009).

In this paper we study a bargaining game with n sellers and n buyers. In real world instances, bargaining mostly occurs between sellers and buyers in exchange. When the market is not monopolized, each buyer can freely choose among sellers to make an exchange. However, a buyer(seller) cannot bargain with another buyer(seller). Therefore, this bargaining game is described as below. n sellers and n buyers are about to bargain on how to share n pies. The bargaining process is like the biding system of stock market. Each seller can either offer a

selling price to all buyers or accept a buying price offered by any buyer. Similarly, each buyer can either offer a buying price or accept a selling price offered by any seller. Here the price is equivalent to the partition rate of a pie. A pair of seller and buyer will share a pie if they can reach an agreement. Each player has a constant discounting factor, which means that the value of pie decreases if a player cannot make an agreement with others within a period of time *t*. The discounting factors and offered prices are known to all players.

We prove that this bargaining game has a bargaining equilibrium with which the bargainers accept a unique price

$$p = (n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{bi})/(n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{si}).$$

where p is the exchange rate or price, δ_{si} and δ_{bi} $(i = 1, ..., n)$ are the discounting factors of the sellers and buyers respectively.

The remainder of this paper is arranged as below. In Section 2, the preliminary knowledge of sequential approach is introduced. The advantage of moving first can be eliminated by introducing a bidding stage in which two players bid for the right to make the first offer. We also deduce the consistency between the axiomatic approach and the sequential strategic approach. In Section 3, we prove the bargaining equilibrium of a two-seller and two-buyer bargaining game and extend the solution to emphn-seller and emphn-buyer case. Section 4 concludes the paper.

1 Two-player Bargaining Game

According to Rubinstein (1982), a two-player bargaining game is described as below:

Two players, 1 and 2, are bargaining on the partition of a pie. The pie will be partitioned only after the players reach an agreement. Each player, in turn offers a partition and his opponent may agree to the offer or reject it. Acceptance of the offer ends the bargaining. After rejection, the rejecting player then has to make a counter offer and so on. If no agreement is

achieved, both players keep their status quo (no gain no loss).

Let X be the set of possible agreements, D the status quo (no agreement), and x_1 and x_2 the partitions of the pie that 1 and 2 receives respectively. The players' preference relations are defined on the set of ordered pairs of the type (x, t) , where t is a nonnegative integer and denotes the time when the agreement is reached, $0 \leq x \leq 1$, $x_1 = x$ and $x_2 = 1 - x$. Let $\succ_i$ denote player i's preference ordering over $X \cup \{D\}$. There are the following assumptions.

A-1. Disagreement is the worst outcome: for every $(x, t) \in X \times T$ we have $(x, t) \succ_i D$.

A-2. 'Pie' is desirable: $(x, t) \succ_i (y, t)$ iff $x_i \geq y_i$.

A-3. 'Time' is valuable: for every $x \in X$, $t_1 < t_2$, if $(x, t_2) \succ_i (d, 0)$ then $(x, t_1) \succ_i (x, t_2)$.

A-4. Stationarity: for every $x, y \in X$, $\Delta > 0$, if $(x, t_1) \succ_i (y, t_1 + \Delta)$ then $(x, t_2) \succ_i (y, t_2 + \Delta)$.

A-5. Continuity: if $(x, t_1) \succ_i (y, t_2)$, there always exists $\epsilon \to 0$ such that $(x + \epsilon, t_1) \succ_i (y, t_2)$.

A-6. Increasing loss to delay: for any $c_1, c_2 > 0$, if $(x + c_1, t) \sim_i (x, 0)$, $(y + c_2, t) \sim_i (y, 0)$ and $x_i > y_i$ then $c_1 \geq c_2$.

The players are with constant discounting factors: each player has a number $0 \leq \delta_i \leq 1$ such that $(x, t_1) \succ_i (y, t_2)$ iff $x_i \delta_i^{t_1} \geq y_i \delta_i^{t_2}$. Under these assumptions, Rubinstein (1982) has proven the following proposition 1.

Proposition 1: (a) There exists a unique perfect equilibrium of this bargaining game (b) If at least one of the δ_i less than 1 and at least one of them is positive, the bargaining solution is $(x, 0)$, where $x = (1 - \delta_2)/(1 - \delta_1 \delta_2)$.

Notice that player 1 is supposed to make the first offer. If player 2 makes the first move, the solution would be $x = (1 - \delta_1)/(1 - \delta_1 \delta_2)$. The player who makes the first offer has an advantage in bargaining and receives a larger partition of the pie than what would be received if another

player had made the first offer.

Binmore, Rubinstein and Wolinsky (1986) gave a procedure to eliminate the advantage of moving first as follows: let the time delay between successive periods be Δ, and represent the discounting factor as δ^{Δ}. Then in the limit $\Delta \to 0$, it is indifferent whoever makes the opening demand.

$$\lim_{\Delta \to 0} x^*(\Delta) = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} y^*(\Delta) = x_N^{TP}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$$

where $x^*(\Delta)$ and $y^*(\Delta)$ denote the pair of agreements and $x_N^{TP}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ is the time preference Nash bargaining solution.

We introduce a new procedure to eliminate the advantage of moving first as follows: two players bid for the right to make the first offer before bargaining for the partition of the pie. Player 1 offers a bid w ($0 \leq w \leq 1$) to player 2 to exchange the right of moving first. If player 2 accepts the bid, she receives w partition of the pie and player 1 begins the bargaining to divide the rest $1 - w$; If player 2 refuses the bid, she wins the right to make the first offer to divide $1 - w$ and player 1 receives w. We have the following proposition 2.

Proposition 2: In the case where two players bid for the right of moving first, the unique bargaining solution is $(x, 0)$, where $x = (1 - \delta_2)/(2 - \delta_1 - \delta_2)$.

Proof: If player 2 accepts w and player 1 makes the first move, according to Proposition 1, two players will receive x_1 and x_2 respectively, where

$$x_1 = \frac{1 - \delta_2}{1 - \delta_1 \delta_2}(1 - w)$$

and $x_2 = 1 - x_1$.

On the other hand, if player 2 declines player 1's bid, two players will receive x_1^* and x_2^*, where

$$x_1^* = w + \frac{\delta_1(1 - \delta_2)}{1 - \delta_1 \delta_2}(1 - w)$$

and $x_2^* = 1 - x_1^*$.

It is obvious that there should be $x_1 = x_1^*$. Then we have

$$w = \frac{(1-\delta_1)(1-\delta_2)}{2-\delta_1-\delta_2}$$

$$x_1 = \frac{1-\delta_2}{2-\delta_1-\delta_2}$$

$$x_2 = \frac{1-\delta_1}{2-\delta_1-\delta_2}$$

■

With the bidding procedure, the bargaining equilibrium remains fixed no matter which player makes the first offer and it is indifferent for each player to make an offer or to accept the opponent's offer. If we regard player 1 as the seller and player 2 the buyer, $p = x_1/x_2 = (1-\delta_2)/(1-\delta_1)$ can be treated as the price of exchange. Specifically, two players share the pie equally when $\delta_1 = \delta_2$ or $p = 1$. Player 2 receives the whole pie when $p = 0$. Player 1 receives the whole pie when $p = \infty$. Proposition 2 also shows the consistency between the strategic bargaining approach and the Nash bargaining solution. Let u_1 and u_2 be the von Neumann-Morgenstern utilities of two players. If we define

$$p_N = \frac{1-\delta_2}{1-\delta_1} = \arg\max\,(u_1(p)u_2(p)) \tag{1}$$

the outcome of Proposition 2 is exactly Nash bargaining solution.

2 A *N*-seller and *N*-buyer Bargaining Game

Consider a market where there are only two goods, *A* and *B*. Participants in this market negotiate to exchange *A* for *B* or to exchange *B* for *A*. Without loss of generality, let's assume that those who want to exchange *A* for *B* are the sellers and those who want to exchange *B* for *A* are the buyers. The price p is then the exchange ratio of the amount of *B* to *A* and it is the only factor

that every player cares for in the bargaining. Each seller prefers a higher price and each buyer prefers a lower price. The assumptions here are *A-1* to *A-3* and that each player can freely choose their bargaining partner. The bargaining game is described as below.

A group of players that contains n sellers and n buyers bargain over the partitions of n pies (each pie is of size of 1). A seller (/buyer) has to reach an agreement with a buyer (/seller) on the division of a pie. Each player has a constant discounting factor and their discounting factors are known to all players(δ_{si} and δ_{bi} for the sellers and buyers respectively, $i = 1, ..., n$, $0 < \delta_{si} < 1$, $0 < \delta_{bi} < 1$). The players bargain in a system like the stock market: each seller(buyer) can either offer a selling(buying) price to all buyers(sellers) or accept a price offered by another buyer(seller). The offered prices are known to all. Once a player accepts a price offered by another player, the division of a pie between them is determined and both players quit the bargaining. The players who do not make any agreement with others remain to the next round and this process will continue until no further agreements are possible or the value of pies decrease to zero.

When an agreement is made, which side offers the price (and which side accepts it) is not important since both sides only care for the price of the agreement. In order to simplify the analysis, we assume that the bargaining process in each round is as follows. The sellers first offer their selling prices. The buyers choose whether or not to accept them. If a buyer does not accept any selling offer, he/she has to offer a buying price. And then the sellers who do not have an agreement choose whether or not to accept a buying price. A round of bargaining ends. The players who do not have an agreement with others enter the next round of bargaining.

We first analyze the bargaining problem of two sellers and two buyers and then extend it to the case of n sellers and n buyers.

2.1 Bargaining problem of two-pair of sellers and buyers

Consider the bargaining problem of two sellers S_1 and S_2 and two buyers B_1 and B_2 whose discounting factors are δ_{s1}, δ_{s2}, δ_{b1} and δ_{b2} respectively. Let F be the set of all strategies of the players who offer the partitions, and G the set of all strategies of the players who have to respond to an offer. The outcome of this bargaining can be expressed by the quad (x_1, t_1, x_2, t_2) where $x_1, x_2 \in X$ denote the partitions of two pies that two pairs of players agree with respectively, t_1, t_2 denote the time when the agreements are made. Notice that $t \to \infty$ denotes 'disagreement' between a seller and a buyer. We have the following proposition.

Proposition 3: A two-seller and two-buyer bargaining game has a unique bargaining equilibrium, a unanimous partition of both pies.

Proof: We first prove that, if there exists a bargaining equilibrium, it must be a unanimous partition of two pies.

Without loss of generality, suppose that the seller S_1 and the buyer B_1 reach the agreement of partition (x_1, t_1) and S_2 and B_2 reach the agreement of partition (x_2, t_2). For the outcome (x_1, t_1, x_2, t_2) to be a perfect equilibrium partition, there must be $x_1 = x_2$ and $t_1 = t_2$.

If $x_1 \neq x_2$, without loss of generality, let's assume $x_1 > x_2$.

(1) If $t_1 > t_2$, B_1 could offer a buying partition x' $(x_2 < x' < x_1)$ at time t_2 and S_2 would accept the offer instead of x_1 so that both players improved their payoffs. Thus, (x_1, t_1, x_2, t_2) is not an equilibrium.

(2) If $t_1 < t_2$, S_2 could offer a selling partition x' $(x_2 < x' < x_1)$ at time t_1 and B_1 would accept it so that both players improved their payoffs. So (x_1, t_1, x_2, t_2) is not an equilibrium.

(3) If $t_1 = t_2$, either B_1 or S_2 would offer a partition x' $(x_2 < x' < x_1)$ to improve their payoffs.

Whenever there are $x_1 \neq x_2$, we can always find a pair of seller and buyer who can be better off by making a deal with new partition x' ($x_2 < x' < x_1$). Thus the equilibrium must be a unanimous partition of two pies.

Second, we prove that there must be a unique bargaining equilibrium in this game. Every player will receive the minimum payoff if they cannot reach a unanimous partition. Realising that they have to reach a unanimous partition, the sellers and buyers actually bargain on a price with which no single player can be better off by deviating from it. Both sellers prefer higher prices to lower prices while both buyers prefer lower prices to higher prices. The bargaining game turns out to be a two-player game, in which one side is the group of sellers and the other side is the group of buyers. According to Proposition 1, there is a unique equilibrium of the two-player bargaining game. Let x^* denote the partition in this equilibrium. In order to be better off, a seller need to make an agreement $x > x^*$ with a buyer. However, the buyer will be worse off with $x > x^*$. It is impossible for a pair of seller and buyer to be better off by deviating from x^*. No individual player has incentive to deviate from x^* unilaterally because it will lead to disagreement. Thus x^* is the unique bargaining equilibrium.

■

In order to determine x^* by adopting a sequential approach, we assume that the sellers first offer a partition to the buyers. If the buyers accept it, two agreements are made and the game ends. Otherwise, the buyers make a counter offer on the discounted pie. The game continues until either two agreements or disagreement is made.

Following Rubinstein (1982) and Osborne and Rubinstein (1990), we define a group of functions v_i ($i = s_1, s_2, b_1, b_2$) as follows.

$$v_i(x,t) = \begin{cases} y, & \exists y \in X \text{ such that } (y,0) \sim_i (x,t) \\ 0, & \forall y \in X \text{ there is } (y,0) \succ_i (x,t) \end{cases}$$

This means that for any (x,t), either there is a unique $y \in X$ such that player i is indifferent

between (x, t) and $(y, 0)$, or every $(y, 0)$ is preferred by i to (x, t). In order for two sellers and two buyers to reach a unanimous partition, there should be $v_{s_1} = v_{s_2}$ and $v_{b_1} = v_{b_2}$. This means that two sellers (buyers) are equal in the bargaining no matter what values their discounting factors are.

In order for two sellers (buyers) to form the same bargaining strategy, there should be

$$v_{s_1}(x, t) = v_{s_2}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{s_1}^t + \delta_{s_2}^t)x \tag{2}$$

$$v_{b_1}(x, t) = v_{b_2}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{b_1}^t + \delta_{b_2}^t)x \tag{3}$$

The intersection of $y_{s_1} = v_1(x_{s_1}, 1)$ and $x_{b_1} = v_1(y_{b_1}, 1)$ reflects the unanimous partition (x^*, y^*). This can be expressed as Fig.1.



Figure 1: Perfect equilibrium (x^*, y^*) for the bargaining game of two-pair of sellers and buyers.

From Fig.1, we have

$$x^* = \frac{2(2 - \delta_{b1} - \delta_{b2})}{4 - (\delta_{b1} + \delta_{b2})(\delta_{s1} + \delta_{s2})} \tag{4}$$

$$y^* = \frac{(\delta_{b1} + \delta_{b2})(2 - \delta_{s1} - \delta_{s2})}{4 - (\delta_{b1} + \delta_{b2})(\delta_{s1} + \delta_{s2})} \tag{5}$$

When the sellers and buyers bid for the right of making the first offer, the advantage of first offer can be eliminated. The process is that the sellers first offers a bid w ($0 \leq w \leq 1$) to the buyers to exchange the right of first offer. If the buyers accept the bid, each buyer receives w partition of a pie and the sellers begin the bargaining to divide the rest of pies; If the buyers refuse the bid, they win the right to make an offer first and each seller receives w.

If the buyers accept the bid, each seller will receive

$$x_1 = \frac{2(2-\delta_{b1}-\delta_{b2})}{4-(\delta_{s1}+\delta s2)(\delta_{b1}+\delta_{b2})}(1-w)$$

If the buyers incline the bid, each seller will receive

$$x_2 = \frac{(\delta_{s1}+\delta_{s2})(2-\delta_{b1}-\delta_{b2})}{4-(\delta_{s1}+\delta s2)(\delta_{b1}+\delta_{b2})}(1-w)+w$$

Obviously, there should be $x_1 = x_2$. Then we have

$$x_1 = \frac{2-\delta_{b1}-\delta_{b2}}{4-\delta_{b1}-\delta_{b2}-\delta_{s1}-\delta_{s2}} \tag{6}$$

Each buyer receives

$$y_1 = 1 - x_1 = \frac{2-\delta_{s1}-\delta_{s2}}{4-\delta_{b1}-\delta_{b2}-\delta_{s1}-\delta_{s2}} \tag{7}$$

Hence,

$$p = x_1/y_1 = \frac{2-\delta_{b1}-\delta_{b2}}{2-\delta_{s1}-\delta_{s2}} \tag{8}$$

According to Proposition 3, a patient player receives the same price as an impatient player in the bargaining. This counterintuitive-seeming result can be explained as below. Because every player would like to choose the impatient player to be their bargaining opponent, the impatient player could increase their share by threatening to change their bargaining opponent. Similarly, the patient player had to lower their share because of their opponent's threat of changing their bargaining opponent. Consequently, a unanimous price will be reached so that the sellers (buyers) receive equal partition no matter how patient or impatient they are.



Figure 2: Relationship between two-player bargaining and two-pair of players bargaining.

Fig.2 shows the relationship between the two-player bargaining equilibrium and the two-seller and two-buyer bargaining equilibrium. If the players bargain with each other independently, the equilibrium of two players bargaining will be either A, C or B, D. When they bargain together, the equilibrium will be (x^*, y^*), which is a point inside the quadrilateral $ABCD$.

2.2 Bargaining problem of n-pair of sellers and buyers

Let S_i and B_i $(i = 1, \cdots, n)$ denote the sellers and buyers respectively, and δ_{s_i} and δ_{b_i} the discounting factors of the sellers and buyers respectively. We have Proposition 4 as below.

Proposition 4: The bargaining problem of n-pair of sellers and buyers has a unique perfect equilibrium: a unanimous price p_n,

$$p_n = (n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{b_i})/(n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{s_i}) \tag{9}$$

Proof: According to the proof of Proposition 3, a perfect equilibrium for this bargaining game must be a unanimous price. It is easy to verify that, if there are different prices, at least one pair

of seller and buyer can be better off by changing their decisions.

Consider the two largest coalitions that contains all sellers and buyers respectively. Let p^* denotes the price determined by these two coalitions. p^* must be an equilibrium because no singular player can be better off by leaving their coalition. For example, a seller would like to leave the coalition only if there is a buyer who would like to accept $p > p^*$. However, any buyer would like to leave their coalition only if there is $p < p^*$. Let δ_{s_A} and δ_{b_A} be the average discounting factor of the coalitions of sellers and buyers respectively.

$$\delta_{s_A} = (\delta_{s_1} + \delta_{s_2} + \cdots + \delta_{s_n})/n \tag{10}$$

$$\delta_{b_A} = (\delta_{b_1} + \delta_{b_2} + \cdots + \delta_{b_n})/n \tag{11}$$

According to (1), there must be

$$p^* = \frac{1-\delta_{b_A}}{1-\delta_{s_A}} = \frac{n-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{b_i}}{n-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{s_i}}.$$

Then, p^* is the unanimous price $p^* = p_n$.

■

The equilibrium of the *n*-seller and *n*-buyer bargaining game can be expressed as Fig.3. Two coalitions reach the agreement of (x^*, y^*). If two coalitions bid for the right to make the first offer, the advantage of making the first offer will be removed. Then, each seller receives x_1,

$$x_1 = \frac{n-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{b_i}}{2n-\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\delta_{s_i}+\delta_{b_i})} \tag{12}$$

Each buyer receives y_1,

$$y_1 = \frac{n-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{s_i}}{2n-\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\delta_{s_i}+\delta_{b_i})} \tag{13}$$

Imagine that there exists a pair of representative seller and buyer, S_A and B_A, whose discounting factors, δ_{s_A} and δ_{b_A}, are the average of discounting factors of all sellers and all buyers



Figure 3: Perfect equilibrium (x^*, y^*) for the bargaining game of n-pair of sellers and buyers.

respectively. The equilibrium of a n-pair players bargaining game is equivalent to the equilibrium of two representative players bargaining game. Let $u_{s_A}(p)$ and $u_{b_A}(p)$ be the von Neumann-Morgenstern utility functions of the representative seller and buyer respectively. If we define

$$p_N = \frac{n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{b_i}}{n - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{s_i}} = \arg\max\,(u_{s_A}(p) u_{b_A}(p)),$$

the outcome of Proposition 4 is consistent with Nash bargaining equilibrium.

3 Conclusions

The bargaining games of two-seller and two-buyer, and further n-seller and n-buyer are analyzed by using a sequential approach. The equilibria of these bargaining games are unanimous prices determined by average discounting factors of all sellers and all buyers. Every player is a price taker when n is large because individual player has trivial power to determine the bargaining price. This conclusion has the potential of being extended to the problems of market-clearing prices in perfectly competitive markets.

In this study, the 2n players are assumed to bargain together so that the bargaining problem can be considered as a game with complete information in which each player knows the discounting factors of all players. This may be unrealistic in real world market, especially when the number of players is relatively large. It sometimes takes time, money, and effort for a player to retrieve certain information. If the cost of information is taken into consideration, a player will have to restrict his negotiation within a limited group of bargainers. Then the propagation of information will have an influence on the bargainers' strategies and different prices will be possible in this circumstance. Bargaining with incomplete information will be our topic of future research.

References

1. Asheim, G. (1992) A unique solution to n-person sequential bargaining, Games and Economic Behavior, 4: 169-181.

2. Binmore, K., Rubinstein A., and Wolinsky, A. (1986) The Nash Bargaining Solution in Economic Modelling, RAND Journal of Economics, 17:176-188.

3. Calvo-Armengo, A. (1999) A note on three-player noncooperative bargaining with restricted pairwise meetings, Economics Letters, 65: 47-54.

4. Chae, S. and Yang, J. (1988) The unique perfect equilibrium of an N-person bargaining game, Economics Letters, 28: 221-223.

5. Chatterjee, K. and Sabourian H. (2000) Multiperson bargaining and strategic complexity, Econometrica, 68: 1491-1509.

6. Dasgupta, A. and Chiu, Y. (1998) On implementation via demand commitment games, International Journal of Game Theory, 27: 161-189.

7. de Fontenay, C. and Gans J. (2004) Bilateral Bargaining with Externalities, Working Paper (University of Melbourne).

8. Haller, H. (1986) Non-cooperative bargaining of NU3 players, Economics Letters, 22: 11-13.

9. Herrero, M. (1985) A strategic bargaining approach to market institutions, Ph.D. thesis (London University, London).

10. Krishna, V. and Serrano, R. (1996) Multilateral bargaining, Review of Economic Studies, 63: 61-80.

11. Kultti K. and Vartiainen H. (2008) Bargaining with many players: a limit result, Economics Letters, 101: 249-252.

12. Merlo, A. and Wilson, C. (1995) A stochastic model of sequential bargaining with complete information, Econometrica, 63: 371-399.

13. Nash, J. (1950) The Bargaining Problem, Econometrica, 18: 155-162.

14. Osborne, M. and Rubinstein, A. (1990) Bargaining and markets, Academic Press, California, ISBN 0-12-528632-5.

15. Rubinstein, A. (1982) Perfect equilibrium in a bargaining model, Econometrica, 50(1): 97-109.

16. Santamaria, J. (2009) Bargaining power in the Nash damand game an evolutionary approach, International game theory review, 11(1): 87-97.

17. Sutton, J. (1986) Non-cooperative bargaining theory: an introduction, Review of Economic Studies, 53: 709-724.

18. Torstensson, P. (2009) An n-person Rubinstein bargaining game, International game theory review, 11(1): 111-115.

19. Vannetelbosch, V. (1999) Rationalizability and equilibrium in n-person sequential bargaining, Economic Theory, 14: 353-371.

20. Vidal-Puga, J. (2004) Bargaining with commitments, International Journal of Game Theory, 33: 129-144.

21. Winter, E. (1994) The demand commitment bargaining and snowballing cooperation, Eco-

nomic Theory, 4: 255-273.

22. Yan, H. (2009) Uniqueness in random-proposer multilateral bargaining, International game theory review, 11(4): 407-417.

23. Yang, J. (1992) Another N-person bargaining game with a unique perfect equilibrium, Economics Letters, 38: 275-277.